

REMARKS

The Official Action of May 26, 2006, has been carefully studied. Allowable claims 1-20 remain in the application. Prosecution on the merits has been closed in accordance with the provisions of *Ex parte Quayle*, and all the claims have been allowed. Applicants' amendments all relate to formalities. Favorable consideration and early formal allowance are respectfully urged.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The drawing has been objected to because Fig. 1 was not labeled "prior art". A replacement drawing including Fig. 1 is attached, in which Fig. 1 has been labeled "prior art". No marked up copy labeled as "Annotated marked-up drawings" is necessary, so none is attached.

Applicant has also discovered a small error in Fig. 4, and so a replacement drawing for Fig. 4 is also attached. In this drawing, the reference numeral 21 has been amended to 21'.

Approval and entry of the replacement drawings are respectfully requested.

Applicants' specification has been objected to as not containing headings. The objection is respectfully traversed because the presence of headings is not mandatory in the rules, but is only preferred.

Nevertheless, in deference to the examiner's views, a substitute specification consistent with the rules is attached hereto in which headings have been inserted. No new matter is introduced by this substitute specification.

The Title has been objected to as being not descriptive, and the Title is also amended in the substitute specification. If the examiner is unsatisfied with the amended Title, the examiner is hereby authorized to further change the Title to what the examiner believes is appropriate.

Approval and entry of the substitute specification are respectfully requested.

All of applicants' claims have been allowed. However, the claims are amended above to put them in better form according to U.S. practice. The amendments are clearly not substantial amendments relating to patentability, are not "narrowing" amendments, and do not reduce the scope of any claims.

The prior art documents of record and not relied upon by the PTO have been noted, along with the implication

Appln. No. 10/509,836
Amd. dated July 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 26, 2006

that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently material to warrant their application against any of applicants' claims.

Applicants believe that all issues raised in the *Ex parte* Quayle Action have been addressed above, and that the present application should now be in condition for early formal allowance. Such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\I\Inte\Dircks1\pto\PCTAMD 26JUL06.doc